DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 572	IR 003 656

AUTHOR	Beach, Allyne
TITLE	Library Book Theft: A Case Study.
PUB DATE	Mar 76
NOTE	123p.; Undergraduate Honor's Thesis, Ohio State University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Book Thefts; Library Research; Questionnaires; *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

As part of an investigation of library theft at Ohio State University, relevant literature was explored, causal hypotheses were formulated, a questionnaire was distributed to a representative sample of 350 students, data were analyzed, and conclusions drawn. Opinions of 19 self-identified book thieves and 231 nonthieves were used to identify the motives for theft, the methods used, and possible preventative measures. The text summarizes the literature search, describes the research methodology, and states the findings, including tabular summaries of questionnaire data. (EMH)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED125572

LIBRARY BOOK THEFT: A CASE STUDY

By

Allyne Beach

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Undergraduate Honor's Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree, Bachelor of Arts
with Distinction in Sociology

The Ohio State University

March, 1976

IR 003 656

Acknowledgments

I extend my warmest appreciation and praise

to my advisor, Dr. Joseph E. Scott, for his challenging questions and for his patience

my gratitude

to Kaye Gapan, Robert Allen Daughtery, and The Ohio State University staff for their co-operation

to the faculty and staff of the Sociology Department for their assistance

and my indebtedness

to my friends and tolerant roommates

to Sue for her encouragement

and to Roberto for all his faith and love

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments i

Chapter

I. Introduction 1

Purpose 1

History 1

Scope 3

II. Literature Review and Construction of Hypotheses 10

Library Factors 10

Bureaucratic Factors 11

University Setting Factors 14

White Collar Crime Factors 16

III. Methodology 25

Sampling 25

Questionnaire 27

Measurement 30

IV. Findings 37

Student Opinion 37

Book Theives' Opinion 56

Hypotheses and Frameworks 84

Implications of Findings 90

Suggestions for Further Research 94

Chapter

V. Conclusion 98

APPENDICES

A. 105
B. 111
BIBLIOGRAPHY 113

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

This research is an investigation of library book theft at The Ohio State University. Specifically, the study attempts to answer such questions as: who steals library books, what are their motivations, and what methods do they use. In addition, opinions of book thieves* and non-thieves are examined with regards to what techniques they feel would best deter and prevent book theft.

The focus of this research will be on book theft only. It will not address the question of journal mutilation, periodical theft, fire or any of the sundry phases of library material loss. The people who are book thieves will be determined by self-reporting techniques. A questionnaire distributed to 466 students will be the principal research tool. The major theoretical perspective will be that used to study white collar crime.

History

Library book theft is not a new problem. Librarians have been aware of this problem for ages. Since the twelfth century, libraries have been plagued by book theft. At that time, the librarians' solution was to chain books to the library walls (Sutuchi, 1973). But as the times have changed, the demand has increased for more ready access to books and other library materials. In addition, librarians have become more sensitive and more responsive to the growing needs of patrons (Gapan, 1975). Consequently, in the present era when the trend is to augment the flow of information and the availability of resource material for numerous people, limitations on library use would inhibit rather than facilitate the goals of contemporary librarians.

---

* Although the term book "thieves" may in some analyses connotate a professional criminal the term thief and stealer will be used interchangeably. In this regard these terms refer to a person who takes a book from the library in an unauthorized manner.

The increased volume of library use today is not unexpectedly associated with an accelerated rate of book loss (Reneker, 1970). The concern over this loss has grown. In 1940, fourteen articles about actual cases of book theft or methods to deter it appeared in the Library Literature. The number of such articles gradually increased, perhaps reflecting a greater concern for this phenomenon. In 1969, there were forty-three articles on book theft in the Library Literature. Yet another indicator of the librarians' heightened concern with this problem is documented in a study of two hundred libraries done by the Burns Security Institute in 1973. Seven out of ten libraries reported theft as their most important problem (Burns Security Institute, 1973).

Scope

The national interest in the library book theft problem stems in part from financial pressure. On the basis of inventories of current books received, librarians estimate that 4 to 6 per cent of their total collection is missing* (Daughtery, 1975). The total dollar loss due to missing books in 140 libraries which responded to a survey conducted by the Burns Security Institute was $437,400 per year or an average annual dollar loss of $3,120 per library, equivalent to about eighty-five books** (Burns Security Institute, 1973). A sample inventory done by Irene Braden in 1967, determined that the per cent of books missing from libraries at The Ohio State University ranged from 1 to 15 per cent*** (Braden, 1968). Librarians at The Ohio State University estimated that the dollar loss due to book theft was approximately $64,000 in 1972. Based on estimations of loss made by The Ohio State University Library statistician the loss would be $140,000 in 1972.# The discrepancy in the figures is due to the fact that the librarians' estimate is based on the average rate of book loss times the amount of money the library spent on replacing books in 1972; the statistician's rate was based on an estimation of the books missing times the average worth of a book in 1972.

---

* Current and popular books have a higher loss rate than other types of library books (Gapan, 1975).

** Most libraries surveyed were small public libraries.

*** Academic libraries generally have a higher loss rate than public ones (Gapan, 1975).

# Although some estimations have been made, actual dollar loss is difficult for librarians to determine. Complete inventories are seldom if ever done due to the tremendous amount of money and time such an undertaking would require. Moreover, the task of determining a book's status (lost vs. stolen) is complicated by the fact that missing books reappear often at the end of a quarter or the school year.

Despite such financial losses, a recent study by Maxine Renecker (1940) showed that librarians feel the major consequence of library book theft is the inconvenience the patron must suffer. It is possible that the librarians responded to Renecker's survey this way because of their conception of proper professional response rather than their actual inclinations. Still, these librarians and those the researcher has talked with, have noticed the frustration the patron and they themselves have undoubtedly experienced spending unrewarded hours searching the stacks or checking in other libraries for desired materials that have been stolen. Consequently, library users are subsequently often forced to write term papers or project reports with incomplete or inadequate resources. Further, the library is often unable to replace all stolen material thus compounding the frustration of missing resources for future users and for librarians who must deal with these patrons.

Librarians have tried publicity campaigns, student security guards, limiting exits, and electronic devices to deter library book theft (Green, 1964). For the most part, as the review of the library literature will reveal, these techniques have been unsuccessful. At The Ohio State University, the concern of librarians has been partially concentrated on means to deter book theft. The director of The Ohio State University Library thinks formality makes students feel alienated and thus more likely to steal books (Atkinson, 1975). Thus, one step the library has taken in response to the directors opinion is to keep formality low. This is accomplished by not requiring a special library card, by employing student personnel, by making access to books relatively easy, and by gently reminding patrons of overdue books with post card notices sent to the patron's residences. These procedures, while perhaps necessary to create a warm, welcome atmosphere, allow greater opportunity to would-be book thieves to steal library materials. A number of counter measures have been implemented to modify such opportunities and hopefully deter book theft. First, a review of The Ohio State's University's newspaper the Lantern, since 1970 indicates the librarians' attempt to curtail book loss by amnesty days (April 1970, 71, 72), librarians' consideration of black listing students who owe over fifty dollars in fines and/or books to the library and revocation of privileges of faculty who will not return books (1973, 75). Second, the Lantern has published several articles and editorials discussing the library book loss problem. In addition, this news paper has had articles on the effectiveness of student security guards and electronic security systems, Check Point and Tattle Tape, installed in the Education, Main, and Commerce Libraries. Third, along with such security devices installed in a number of libraries, librarians have limited the number of exits and entrances to one central point. Fourth, librarians here have also distributed questionnaires in the Commerce and Biological Science Libraries to gather information about book theft and what can be done about it. Last, and perhaps the most decisive action librarians have taken has been against book multilators. Since the summer of 1975 the Commerce Library has been enforcing section 2909.10 (12488) of the Ohio Criminal Code which states:

> 2909.10 (12488). Destroying books or paintings.
>
> No person shall intentionally deface, obliterate, tear, or destroy, in whole or in part, or cut or remove an article or advertisement or any page or part of any scientific material, newspaper, book, magazine, or periodical belonging to another person, association, corporation, or public library, or intentionally deface, obliterate, or destroy, in whole or in part, any picture, painting, sculpture, statue, monument, or any work of art or reproduction of work of art, belonging to another person, association, corporation, museum, or public library.
>
> Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than five hundred dollars or imprisoned not more than thirty days, or both.

In this way the librarians are employing the power of the state as well as that of the university.

Library book theft is costly not only financially but also psychologically. One librarian, Oscar Treiles (1973), estimates the loss due to book theft nationwide at five million dollars. No one has calculated the man hours lost searching for lost books. Like other types of deviant behavior, theft prevents the system from working as smoothly as it might by forcing libraries to spend money on replacing books rather than on expanding their collection. Moreover, at best, library book theft means the patron is deprived of his or her time, and, at worst, the person is deprived of needed information.

Despite the extent of the library book theft problem, only scanty research has been done. Most of the research which has been done deals with deterrence systems. Still, as will be seen from the review of the literature most of the articles concern speculation and opinion of librarians rather than empirical studies of library patrons and book thieves. Thus a study which examines the attitudes of the student community, particularly those of book thieves is essential.

Not only should this study increase the knowledge of how and why library book theft is accomplished but also this knowledge may help librarians determine effective methods for deterrence.

A review of the literature dealing with book theft and white collar crime in general will be given in Chapter II.

Chapter III will discuss this particular study including the sample, questionnaire construction and administration as well as other methods employed in analyzing the data. The findings themselves and the interpretation of the data will be presented in Chapter IV. Finally, Chapter V will summarize the study and discuss its implications.

REFERENCES

Chapter I

Atkinson, Hugh
1975 interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Braden, Irene A.
1968 "A Pilot Inventory of Library Holdings." American Library Association Bulletin. 62:1129-31.

Burns Security Institute
1973 National Survey on Library Security Bethesda, Md.:ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED080131.

Daughtery, Robert Allen
1975 interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Gapen, Kaye
1975 interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Green, H.
1964 "Analysis of Literature Dealing With Vandalism as Indexed in Library Literature 1953-63." Master's thesis, Atlanta University.

Reneker, Maxine
1970 "Book Theft in Academic Libraries." Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1970.

Sutuci, Sano
1975 "Protection: Open Access form Chained Libraries." Tosh-Kai. 25:27-30.

Trelles, Oscar M.
1973 "Protection of Libraries." Law Library Journal 66:241-258.

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will review the literature on library book theft and develop hypotheses applicable to this particular study. The discussion will consider literature in many diverse areas. Not only is this done for the sake of completeness, but also it is done to give this project more continuity with other research.* The literature will be presented in this manner: First the literature dealing with a specific aspect of library book theft will be examined, second, a discussion about the literature will ensue, third, a list of hypotheses or possible areas of investigation will be given. The literature review involves a survey of material from diverse disciplines.

Library Factors

While the conceptual framework associated with white collar crime is the reference point for this research, other hypotheses based on knowledge of librarians, security systems analysts, university educators and administrators, and social scientists will be taken into account. The first area of the research to be discussed is library factors. Most of the articles in library periodicals addressing the topic of book theft deal with techniques which constitute an environmental design in libraries to minimize book theft. These include the utilization of electronic devices, the allowance of only one exit, the rearrangement of furniture, the placement of shelves for better viewing, extension of library hours and the assignment of fines to book thieves (Savage, 1959; Reneker, 1970; Quick; 1964; Feret, 1972; Berry, 1965; Morrison, 1966; Clark and Haydee, 1969). The factors discussed most frequently in the literature were included in this study's survey. Students were asked to evaluate the efficacy of the addition of electronic devices, the assignment of fines to book thieves, the provision of more library hours, and the instigation of publicity campaigns in curbing book theft. The hypotheses drawn from the literature were that such environmental changes will reduce book theft.*

---

* For a discussion of constructing hypotheses in a new area of research see Frank Westie, "Toward Closer Relations Between Theory and Research: A Procedure and An Example," American Sociological Review, Vol. 22, 2 (April, 1957), pp. 150-154.

Bureaucratic Factors

A second area of the literature to be considered was derived from a study by Oliner and Manuel (1975). In this study, they tested assumptions that theft is in response to material deprivation, for kicks, and for status pressure (the idea that the act itself makes a person appear more like an adult). They also explored the ideas that stealers have a significant other, a member of the person's family, peer group etc., that stole and that people who steal books do so as a political protest. From this examination, they found that both stealers and non-stealers perceive material deprivation as a powerful motivation to steal and that more stealers than non-stealers believe role models encourage people to steal. In addition, Oliner and Manuel found that stealers increasingly rationalize their behavior by saying that they steal in protest against the university. Stealers feel that big business and the university are related; as a result of this relation they feel that their university has lost touch with their values.

---

* Humphries (1974) thinks that students used the theories presented in this discussion as rationales. However, he believes that the only way to deter crime is by changing the environment.

An intriguing study by Erwin Smigel (1972) concerning attitudes toward stealing in relation to the victim organization has some of the same political protest overtones as the Oliner and Manuel study (1975). Smigel found that while the 212 Indiana residents interviewed generally disapprove of stealing, if forced they would prefer to steal from large business, first, from government, second and finally, from small business. The principles involved seemed to Smigel to be "least evil" (they think that big business has excess profit,that big business cheats the general public) and "least risk." Although these two were the main factors, Smigel urges other variables like anonymity, bureaucracy, power, and impersonality may play a part in the respondents' decision.

A study by Stern (1966) on the effects college environments have on students may indicate why these findings are particularly relevant to book theft in a large university setting. Stern found that schools with over 12,000 students such as The Ohio State University, tend to have "low student dignity." "Low student dignity" is defined as students having little voice in the affairs of the university.*

Stern's findings in light of Smigel's and Oliner's and Manuel's studies suggest that students might feel more comfortable taking books from a larger university than a smaller one or even from a larger library as opposed to a smaller library or department library with which a student may identify. If students feel the school itself does not fulfill their values and the university is more concerned with administrative efficiency rather than with the values of the student and/or the student feels there is less chance of being caught stealing from a larger library, the student may be more likely to steal books from a larger university or library. Using this analysis, three hypotheses will be derived. These are: people steal books in protest against the university which they think is like "big business;" students feel there is less "risk" stealing from a large library than a small library; students feel less guilty stealing from a large library than a small or department library.

---

* A study by Pace (1964) in which techniques similar and in some cases identical to Stern's were used, found the values of the larger university and these of the students of the larger university are the same. Furthermore, if, in some case, university values conflict with the student's values, the student will yield his values and the values of his peers in favor of the university. Nevertheless, this apparent discrepancy between Stern's and Pace's findings may be explained by the fact that, although there is wide variation between colleges and departments, students belong to a more dominant culture which is practical and status oriented. Perhaps this dominant culture encourages the students to at least accept or perhaps adapt their values to that of the university itself, if they conflict.

University Setting Factors

A third area of the literature concerning theft in the university setting will be presented. Six out of seven shoplifters interviewed by Walter Lunden (1966) in his study of college shoplifters revealed that they shoplifted because it presented a challenge or because it was an acceptable way to obtain items for themselves or others. Lunden summarized his study by saying shoplifters stole books for "kicks." Only a small per cent of students in the Oliner and Manuel study and a small per cent of the non-stealers in Lunden's study felt "kicks" was a rationale for stealers (Oliner and Manuel; 1975, Lunden, 1966). Still, the hypothesis that students steal library books for kicks will be examined in this research.

A second description of college theft is derived from a study by Poland. In his research of college students at Purdue University, Poland (1971) explored the hypothesis that theft among college students is a gang type behavior.* He found class background and attitude toward the law of male stealers to be the same as male non-stealers. Aside from class rank, the only difference which appeared between stealers and non-stealers was that stealers participated more in premarital sex, marijuana smoking and liquor buying for minors. Consequently, Poland's hypothesis was unsupported by his research. Similarly, Waldo and Hall (1970) found that attitudes among junior high students towards the criminal justice system did not differ significantly between those who had and those who had not violated the law. Yet, when E.W. Vaz (1969) studied the attitudes of public and private high school students, he found private school boys had a less rigid interpretation of the law. He also found that private school boys had a greater propensity to speed in their automobile, drink alcohol, etc. This research suggests that one of the components of library book theft might be one's peer or family view of book theft as well as the view the stealer and the general community hold on the degree of "rightness" or "wrongness" of stealing a book.

---

* Poland based his study on Sutherland's and Cressey's notion of differential association. Poland interpreted this concept by saying stealers learn methods and attitudes from their friends.

White Collar Crime Factors

The hypotheses identified thus far deal with the effectiveness of changing the environment, that book theft is affected by bureaucracy and may be a result of people viewing the university as a "big business," that books are stolen for kicks, and that book theft is a result of gang behavior. The major thrust of the study, however, is to examine library book theft as a form of white collar crime. In this regard, discussion of library book theft will entail a description of the types of pressures which may lead to book theft, a comparison of library book theft with shoplifting, and a discussion of the white collar crime perspective may be appropriate to analyze library book theft in an academic setting.

From the literature review and from selected interviews by the researcher, it appears that library book theft is a response to pressure. Curtis, a security expert, argues that this pressure is a kind of social psychological pressure; for example, a way to compensate for a highly neurotic need (Nunes, 1972). Other librarians, however, feel that academic pressure is the major motivation of book thieves.* Lee Zimmerman (1960) in his article, "Pilfering and Mutilating Books," and Maxine Renecker on the basis of her nationwide survey both feel academic pressure is the primary explanation to account for library book theft. Norman Vines (1969) who investigated book theft in two high school libraries, one in a higher and one in a lower economic area, also feels academic pressure is important. Finally, the opinion that book theft is due to academic pressure is echoed by Rita Schefrin in her introduction to her synopsis of library security systems (Schefrin, 1971).

Response to this pressure by the academic book thief is parallel to that of the shoplifter. Shoplifting, according to Cameron (1969) involves a drive for economic gain and no legitimate means of obtaining it. Shoplifting entails a sort of material deprivation, a group to instruct, and group support. Material deprivation has been mentioned several times in the literature. Material deprivation used in this context has a special connotation. Material deprivation, for book theft, and perhaps for shoplifting as well, is a material deprivation of needs artifically created by the system and not necessarily required by the individual to survive. The deprivation may be related to a perceived need by the individual to maintain his or her role in a system or culture. The model of library book thieves being comparable to shoplifters has also been suggested by Kaye Gapan (forthcoming) in her analysis of book theft. In sum, it appears that like the shoplifter and the white collar criminal as described by Sutherland, Cressey, Geis, and many others, the patron who removes books in an unauthorized manner in the course of his or her work, his or her role as a student, does so as a result of the pressures of his or her status rather than for a source of income.

---

* Although this research is not dealing directly with mutilation, it is interesting to note the ideas of those who have studied it. Mutilators responding to interview by Clyde Hendrick and Marjorie Murfin (1974), revealed that they mutilated books because of pressure of assignments.

The researcher has taken a electic approach because no research has necessarily made any of the hypotheses less tenable with regards to library book theft. However the researcher has emphasized the white collar crime framework because this perspective seems to encompass the aspects of crime, types of behavior, group attitudes, unclear definition of the act, and motivations for the act, the most completely and concisely. This perspective seems applicable because library patrons, particularly at a university, are generally from a middle-class background. Finally, this perspective is supported by the opinions of librarians who have studied this problem although only one librarian, Gapan, has placed it in such a framework. Therefore, this perspective seems to be the most appropriate for the library book theft phenomenon.

Library book theft appears to be a type of avocational crime, that is a crime by a person who does not think of himself as a criminal. (Avocational crime is a term coined by Geis, 1974.) His or her major source of income or status comes from a source other than the crime

the person commits. As suggested by Kaye Gapan (1975), library book theft may also be deterable by publically labeling it as a crime. The act of library book theft will be defined for this research as the intentional removing of books from the library in an unauthorized manner (Green, 1964).

This chapter has summarized the literature dealing with library book theft. The perspectives that will guide the analysis of the data are: library environmental design, bureaucratic factors, library book theft as motivated by kicks, library book theft as a result of gang behavior, and white collar crime factors. The following list of hypotheses will be tested.

A. Library Factors

1. Electronic devices will curb book theft.
2. More xeroxing machines will curb book theft.
3. Fining book thieves will curb book theft.
4. Conducting publicity campaigns will curb book theft.

5. Library book thieves do not have enough time to use the library.
6. The expense of xeroxing motivates people to steal.
7. Student security guards will curb book theft.

B. Bureaucratic Factors

1. People steal books in protest against the university which they think resembles "big business."
2. Books are more likely to be stolen from larger than a smaller library.
3. Purpose of library (e.g. department, reference) affects place where books are stolen.*

C. University Setting Factors

1. Book thieves steal books for kicks.
2. Book thieves learn their methods for stealing rather than develop methods themselves.
3. Perception of "rightness" or "wrongness" of book theft is shared by book thieves and their friends. Book thieves will define the act as the book thieves' friends do.

D. White Collar Crime Factors

1. People are unsure if library book theft is right or wrong.

---

* Direction of relationship is not hypothesized.

2. People steal books because of academic pressure.
    a. Students deal with stiff competition by stealing books to keep them from their peers.
    b. Students steal books because they cannot afford to buy books,
    c. Students steal books to get better grades.
    d. Students steal books to have the books for their personal collection.
    e. Grade point, class rank, and college may influence academic pressure.*
3. Stealer's friends perceive book theft as legitimate.
4. Stealers are of middle class background.
5. Sanctions against book theft are not often enforced. When they are, the sanctions do not affect the stealer's "life chances."

Each of these hypotheses will be individually examined and commented upon in Chapter IV.

---

* Direction of relationship is not hypothesized.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER II

Berry, John N.
1965 "To Catch a Thief," Library Journal 90:1617-1621.

Cameron, Mary Owen
1964 Booster and the Snitch. London: Free Press of Glenco, Collier and Macmillan Limited.

Clark, Robert F. and G. Haydee
1966 "Your Charging System: Is It Theft Proof?" Library Journal 91:642-643.

Feret, Barbara L.
1972 "Point of Sale," Wilson Library Bulletin 47:46-47.

Gapan, Kaye
1971 "The Book Thief." Master's thesis, University of Washington

Geis, Gilbert
1974 "Avocational Crime," Handbook of Criminology, Daniel Glaser, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 272-273.

Green, H.
1964 "Analysis of Literature Dealing With Vandalism as Indexed in Library Literature 1953-63," Master's thesis, Atlanta University.

Hendrick, Clyde and Marjorie E. Murfin
1974 "Project Library Ripoff: A Study of Periodical Mu tilation in a University Library," College and Research Libraries 35:402-411.

Humphries, Russell
1974 "Why Do They Steal," The College Store Journal, 104-105.

Lunden, Walter A.
1966 Shoplifting Among College Students. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Science and Technology.

Morrison, Perry D.
1966 "Lost Book Campaign in Sacramento," Wilson Library Bulletin 40:526-529.

Nunes, John
1972 "The Electronic Librarian," College Management 7:26-27.

Oliner, S.P. and Maurice, Manuel
1975 "Student Theft: Crime or Protest," Humboldt Journal of Social Relations.

Pace, C. Robert
1964 The Influence of Academic and Student Subcultures in College and University Environments. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services DE 003037.

Poland, Stephen G.
1971 "Characteristics, Behavior, and Attitudes of Male College Students Who Have Committed Theft." Ph.D. Dissertation, Purdue University.

Quick, Mary
1964 "A Proposed Program for Reducing Book Losses," Master's thesis, West Michigan University.

Reneker, Maxine
1970 "Book Theft in Academic Libraries." Master's thesis, University of Chicago.

Savage, Ernest A.
1959 "Buy, Borrow, or Steal: Thieves' Methods," Library Journal 84:141-145.

Schefrin, Rita A.
1971 "The Barriers to and Barriers of Library Security," Wilson Library Journal 45:870-878.

Smigel, Erwin
1970 "Attitudes Towards Stealing Related to Size of Victim Organization" in Crime Against Bureaucracy, Erwin Smigel and H. Lawrence Ross eds. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 15-27.

Stern, George G.
1966 Studies of College Environments. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 010647.

Vaz, E.W.
1969 "Delinquency and Youth Culture: Upper and Middle Class Boys," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science 60:33-46.

Vinnes, Norman
1969 "A Search for Meaning in Book Theft," Scholastic Librarian 18:25-27.

Waldo, Gordon P. and Mason E. Hall
1970 "Delinquency Potential and Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System," Social Forces 49:291-298.

Zimmerman, Lee
1960 "Pilfering and Mutilating Books," Bookmark 13:5-9.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

The case study method will be used in this research. This method was chosen because the study is exploratory in nature, the results of this research will determine if more research is warranted. The library system at The Ohio State University is a good choice for study because its library system has a wide variety of library materials and security systems. Also a representative sample of The Ohio State University student population provides as much heterogeneity in respondents as possible.

A discussion of why and how this particular sample was chosen, how the questionnaire was developed and administered, and what techniques of measurement were employed will be presented in the following sections.

Sample

The sample was drawn from college students* enrolled in various classes at The Ohio State University in the fall of 1975. The classes were chosen because the researcher was interested in surveying a heterogeneous sample with regards to experience with library materials and deterrent systems and with regards to class rank and field of study.* Classes were chosen by examining the enrollment of all the classes in the fall quarter of 1974 in each college on the basis of class rank and college. If the enrollment books were unavailable, deans or administrative assistants or in one case the counselor of the college listed courses that would have students of intercollege diversity** and a majority of juniors and seniors. The researcher concentrated on juniors and seniors because a poll by The Ohio State University's PULSE (1974) indicated that juniors

---

* Undoubtedly a major factor in the library loss rate is employee theft. In fact, Mary Cameron (1964) in her works on shoplifting estimates the loss rate due to employee theft at 67 per cent. Moreover, instances of library employees stealing books have been cited in the library literature (ALA Asks Victimized Libraries to Contact Librarians Guilty of Stealing Pertaining to Special Committee, 1964; Librarians Guilty of Stealing Purloining

---

Converting Federal Property on Loan to Library. 1964) Some of these concern employees abusing their check-out privileges; others deal with stealing from rare collections. William Bond (1973) in his article on book store security suggests, in addition, that rapid turnover leads to theft. At The Ohio State University the turnover rate for both student part-time employees and civil service equivalents (clerks, library assistants, for example) is 25 per cent per year (The Ohio State University, 1975). However, because of time and monetary limitations and because the researcher suspects the self report rate would not be as valid among library employees, this study will be limited to an examination of students.

* The librarians at The Ohio State University conducted a study similar to this one in 1973-74 using only library patrons for a sample. Sampling a group of students more varied in type and frequency of library use, will serve as a check on their findings.

** An example of a class with intercollege diversity would be Accounting 212 with business administration, finance, marketing, and accounting and perhaps students in other colleges taking accounting in preparation for law school.

and seniors were the principal users of the library system.

Classes were selected from this list by practical considerations.* These classes were: Microbiology, 509, French 101, Statistics 125, Accounting 212, Sociology 430, Classics 120, Astronomy 150, English 290, English 205, and Sociology 790. Although choosing classes on a practical consideration may have introduced systematic error into the sample, midway through the survey answers to the questions concerning demographic variables were reviewed and the sample characteristics were found to be representative of the students at The Ohio State University.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire method was deemed the most appropriate way to tap the opinions of many students in a variety of fields and all class ranks. In addition, the questionnaire, particularly a self-administered one such as this, facilitated obtaining a large sample quickly. The questionnaire was administered by the researcher in nine classes and by the researcher's colleague in one class,

---

* Practical considerations include if the researcher was free when the class was offered, etc. If the researcher knew the instructor she contacted the instructor beforehand to arrange an appropriate day to survey. If the researcher did not know the instructor, she arrived ten minutes before the class was there, explained her research, and asked the instructor for permission to survey the class. Although no instructor refused, the instructor of Accounting 212 asked the researcher to return later on in the week because the class was reviewing for an examination.

Sociology 790. Of the 446 questionnaires administered, 14 per cent or 66 questionnaires were unuseable because they were answered in a haphazard manner or were incomplete.*

The questionnaire was developed from the review of the literature. It was pretested twice; each time to twenty people as they entered or exited from the Main Library.** The original questionnaire was revised after the first pretest based on the comments of the researcher's peers and professors as well as those of the respondents original. A second pretest questionnaire was composed primarily of closed-ended responses which would allow easy coding and easy replication of the study. A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

Although slight alterations and modifications were made to accommodate the idiosyncracies of each classroom setting, an effort was made to keep a consistent procedure from class to class.* Questionnaires were given to students already seated and to others as they entered the classroom. No questionnaires were given to students who entered the classroom five minutes after the hour unless they insisted on filling one out after hearing the topic of the questionnaire.** Before and while the researcher distributed the remaining questionnaires to latecomers, she introduced herself by name and explained that the questionnaire was being done in co-operation with the Department of Sociology and the library. At this point and several times while the students were completing the questionnaire it was emphasized that the responses were anonymous. Other than those printed on the questionnaire, these were the only instructions given.*** The questionnaire took between seven and thirteen minutes to complete. After the questionnaires were returned to the researcher, she debriefed the students.*

---

* These questionnaires were however analyzed apart from the "good" data. The answers, except for the responses concerning motivation, were similar to the general sample. Those who answered the questionnaire in a haphazard manner more frequently chose outsmarting the library and stiff competition as motivations for book theft. Although more than one half of these respondents left these questions blank, the demographic variables that were available indicate that these people parallel the other students in the study in background, except for field of study. Business administration students most frequently completed the questionnaire haphazardly. No nurses or allied medical students completed the questionnaire in an inconsistent manner.

** The self-report rate from these questionnaires was 5 per cent.

---

* While the researcher was surveying she was concerned about the varying amounts of interest and co-operation that the classes seemed to have in this study. However, when the results obtained from each class were compared these differences did not appear significant except in the case of business administration. The researcher surveyed a class with business administration students on a day students were discussing their test results.

** This time boundary was set to maintain a degree of time consistency from class to class as well as to prevent the questionnaire from taking too much time away from the instructor's planned lecture.

*** Yet as the researcher became aware that people were not taking the questionnaire as seriously as they might, she stressed the importance of the straight answers to the questionnaire honestly so the results would be effective in upgrading the library's ability to serve them.

After each surveying session, the researcher assigned a three digit code to each questionnaire with the first number being the same for each questionnaire completed in one class. This was done to aid comparative analysis of each class. In addition, the researcher logged comments, events, and the procedure implemented in the preceding session.

Questionnaires were then coded and key-punched.** The few numerical answers were coded as given. Other open ended questions such as those dealing with demographic variables were collapsed and assigned a numeric code. If a person wrote an answer in, an answer code was developed to include it too.*** Finally, if the person made comments about the questionnaire, a question or questions about library book theft or about the library itself a special note in the form of a code was made on the questionnaire's respective computer card.

Measurement

There is no official record kept by law enforcement agencies or courts of the amount of library book theft, so it is a hidden crime. There are two ways of ascertaining data on hidden crime, victimization studies and self-report studies. Although libraries, the victims of library book theft, have computed rough estimates, the number of stolen books can only be guessed at. Since the victimization rate is difficult to determine, self reporting is the remaining technique. Most of the research reviewed in Chapter II utilized the self-report technique to determine the number and characteristics of participants in theft. In addition, this technique has been used with populations similar to college students. In this study, the researcher also relied on the self-reporting technique to distinguish book thieves from non-book thieves.*

---

* Only one questionnaire was not coded. That was one where the researcher observed two people collaborating. They gave answers like president of the United States as father's occupation.

** This occured with four questions and only in one case did the written-in responses exceed 2 per cent of the total. With that question written in response represented 4 per cent of the total answers.

This technique was perfected in 1957 by Nye and Short (1957). It has been used extensively since then, for example to compare self-report data with such traits as social-economic class (Clark and Wenniger, 1962) self concept (Tangri and Schwartz, 1967) and official records (Gould, 1969). Others have tried to validate the results of self-report data by accompanying it with a polygraph test (Clark and Tift, 1966) or with the co-operation of self-reporter's friends (Hood and Sparks, 1970).

---

* While many sources were used for this discussion, the framework for this discussion is based on Hood and Spark's discussion, pages 46 to 70.

There are two methods of administering the self-report technique, interviewing and self-completion. The self-completion technique was employed in this study. Although the self-completion technique has been criticized because it encounters such difficulties as general comprehension and poor motivation both Dentler and K. Elmhorn found the per cent of questionnaires discarded due to this reaction to be 3 to 4 per cent and 0.5 per cent respectively (Hood and Sparks, 1970). Furthermore studies using this technique have not found exaggeration to be much of a problem. What may compound this problem of exaggeration however, is a person's interpretation of a question (Hood and Sparks 1970).* Hopefully some of these misconceptions were eliminated by the pretest and by the fact that the researcher and the persons in this study both attend The Ohio State University. Since the researcher shares the same middle-class background as the majority of the students and the same university education the researcher should be able to use a vocabulary comprehensible to both. Since the researcher and the subjects have similar vocabularies this study should not encounter many of the problems of other studies using the self-report technique where the researcher is older and may be of a different culture or class than his subjects. Another method to eliminate this problem was to ask the respondent to specify the use of the book after it is taken, for example: did you keep it, sell it, or return the book eventually. Finally, the self-completion technique promotes anonymity.

---

* Martin Gold found in his study that more upper or middle-class white boys tended to confess accidental or trival acts of property destruction as a violation that did poorer white boys (Hood and Sparks, 1970). This should not be important in this study.

Occupational and educational levels were grouped according to the Hollingshead scale (Hollingshead, 1964). The income was categorized by Bureau of the Census listings (Bureau of Census, 1972).

Crosstabulations and frequency distributions were chosen to analyze this data because most of the data was nominal. The mode and index of dispersion were used to describe the central tendency and variability of the data. Chi-square was used to test for independence among the components of the various perspectives: library factors, bureaucratic factors, university setting factors, and white collar crime factors outlined in Chapter II. Chi-square was also used to test the relationship the demographic variables have with the components of the hypotheses as well. Chi-square was employed as a test for significance between those who reported either that they themselves or that their best friend stole books and those who did not. The significance level was set at 0.05. Phi, or where appropriate, Cramer's V, was used to measure the degree of association.

In this chapter the sampling, questionnaire construction, and techniques for measurement were discussed. The case study method was used in this research. The mass administration of the questionnaire eliminated a degree of self-selection in the sample. Although it is not necessarily representative of the general population, the sample is heterogeneous and fairly representative of the students attending The Ohio State University in the fall of 1975. Because of the nature of the crime, self-reporting was used To find those who steal books. The statistics appropriate to nominal data will be employed for analysis.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER III

1965 "ALA Asks Victimised Libraries to Contact Special Committee," Library Journal 89:1574.

Bond, William
1973 Eleven Steps Can Lead You to Curtailing Inventory Losses and Crime in the Campus Bookstore. College and University Business 54:3:53.

Bureau of the Census
1972 Social and Economic Statistics of United States, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Cameron, Mary Owen
1964 Booster and the Snitch. London: Free Press of Glenco, Collier, and Macmillan limited.

Clark, John P. and Eugene P. Wenninger
1962 "Socio-Economic Class and Areas Correlates of Illegal Behavior Among Juveniles." American Sociological Review 24:826-834.

Clark, John P. and Larry L. Tift
1966 "Polygraph and Interview Validation of Self-Reported Deviant Behavior," American Sociological Review 31:516-523.

Gould, Leroy C.
1969 "Who Defines Delinquency: A Comparison of Self-Reported and Officially Reported Indices of Delinquency for 3 Racial Groups," Social Problems 16:325-326.

Hollingshead, August B.
1965 Two Factor Index of Social Position. Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut.

Hood and Sparks
1970 Key Issues in Criminology: New York: World University Library 46-70.

1969 "Librarians Guilty of Stealing, Purloining and Converting Federal Property on Loan to Library," Library Journal, 94:24000.

Nye, F. Ivan and James F. Short
1957 "Scaling Delinquent Behavior." American Sociological Review 22:326-331.

1975 Personal Office of the Ohio State Library Interview held in Ohio State University Main Library Room 208, June 1957.

The Ohio State University
1974 An Ohio State University Poll Report on Student Library Usage. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Trangri, Savera and Michael Schwartz
1967 "Delinquency Research and Self Concept Variable," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 58:182-190.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

This chapter will report the opinions and demographic variables of students who completed the questionnaire, with a separate examination of those who admitted to book theft. First, students' opinions of the seriousness of library book theft will be examined. Second, students' opinions about people's motivations to take books, about what factors affect the procedure involved in taking books, and about what methods they feel would be effective in curbing book theft will be discussed. The second part of this chapter will contrast the backgrounds and opinions of those who admitted to stealing books and those who did not. The third and fourth sections will deal with how the findings supported the hypotheses outlined in Chapter II and the implications of these findings.

Students Opinion

As Tables 1 through 9 incidate, the student sample was heterogeneous on all variables. The distribution of this sample is similar to The Ohio State University Poll's distribution, given in Appendix B. This sample contains a greater proportion of juniors and seniors than in The

Ohio State University population. Otherwise, however, the sample is fairly representative of The Ohio State University population for the Fall of 1975 as well.*

The student sample was diverse with regards to fields of study. Over 20 per cent of the sample are in a professional field of study. Approximately 15 per cent of the student respondents are in agriculture, home economics or natural resources. Those who studied social and behavioral sciences composed 14 per cent of the sample (Table 1).

The sample is almost equally divided between males and females (See Table 3). The class standing of students was skewed toward more advanced students (see Table 2). Seniors composed 20 per cent of the sample and juniors, 20 per cent of the sample, while freshmen comprised 15 per cent of the sample. The greater proportion of juniors and seniors were included in the sample because a 1974 poll by The Ohio State University's poll found that juniors and seniors use the library more frequently than underclassmen.

The social-economic background of the sample is also skewed towards the middle class (see Tables 4 through 7). Medium professionals-administrative personnel, lesser professionals, proprietors of medium business ($35,000 to

---

*The researcher examined the statistics given by The Ohio State University Statistics.

TABLE 1

Respondent's Field of Study**

	Per Cent	Number
Professional and pre-professional*	22.0***	(81)
Agriculture, home economics, and natural resources	14.7	(54)
Social and behavioral sciences	14.1	(52)
Arts and humanities	13.5	(50)
Biological and physical sciences	6.8	(25)
Business administration	10.1	(37)
College of education	7.9	(29)
University college or general studies	10.6	(30)
Missing		(12)
Total	100.0	(380)

---

* Occupational and educational levels were grouped according to Hollingshead scale (1965). They were further collapsed into groups containing 30 or more cases. The income was categorized according to the Bureau of the Census (1972) listings. Major or department was grouped by colleges and later on the basis of Stern's (1966) and Pace's (1964) research on major field and corresponding attitudes: engineers, architects, allied medical people, nurses and pre-professional; arts and humanities students, natural resources, home economics and agriculture students; education; and miscellaneous including general studies, university college, and undecided. Other questions such as stealing a book were categorized as yes or no.

** Questions concerning demographic characteristics had the most missing answers. A few people wrote that they felt these questions were none of the researcher's business or not applicable.

*** The per cents given in this and subsequent tables have been adjusted for missing data.

TABLE 2

Respondent's Class Rank

	Per Cent	Number
Graduate, professional, or continuing education	7.5	(28)
Seniors	19.6	(74)
Juniors	31.8	(120)
Sophomores	26.0	(98)
Freshmen	15.1	(57)
Missing		(3)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 3

Respondent's Sex

	Per Cent	Number
Male	51.6	(195)
Female	48.4	(182)
Missing		(4)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 4

The Occupation of the Principal Wage Earner in Respondent's Family

	Per Cent	Number
Major Professional	22.9	(76)
Medium professional	33.2	(110)
Semi-professional and farmers	11.1	(27)
Technical and clerical	23.7	(90)
Unemployed, receiving some sort of government benefits	8.4	(28)
Missing		(38)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 5

Combined Family Income of Respondents

	Per Cent	Number
Greater than $25,000	26.4	(93)
$15,000 - $24,999	34.4	(121)
$10,000 - $14,999	27.3	(96)
$ 5,000 - $ 9,999	9.4	(33)
less than $4,999	2.6	(9)
Missing		(28)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 6

Education of Principal Wage Earner in Respondent's Family

	Per Cent	Number
Graduate or Professional training	17.8	(62)
College education	25.8	(90)
Vocational or up to three years of college	18.6	(65)
High school or less	37.7	(152)
Missing		(31)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 7

Percentage of Respondent's Current Educational Expenses Paid for by His or Her Family

	Per Cent	Number
Zero per cent	34.6	(129)
Twenty-five per cent	15.3	(57)
Fifty per cent	11.3	(42)
Seventy-five per cent	17.7	(66)
One hundred per cent	21.2	(79)
Missing		(4)
Total	100.0	(380)

$100,000) made up 33 per cent; technical and clerical workers, 27 per cent of the sample. Those who were unemployed or receiving some type of government benefits comprised 8 per cent of the sample. Educational level of the family was measured by asking the respondent to give the highest level of education of the person who was the principal wage earner of the family. Thirty-eight per cent of the respondents reported that this person in their family had a high school education or less, 26 per cent reported that the principal wage earner in their family had a college education, 18 per cent reported that this person had graduate or professional training, and 19 per cent said this person had either vocational training or between one and three years of college. Sixty per cent of the sample had a combined family income of $15,000 a year or more. Twenty-seven per cent had income levels between $10,000 and $14,999 a year. This distribution indicates that most students in this study have a middle-class background. Finally, 25 per cent of the sample were not dependent on their parents for current educational expenses. Twenty-one per cent of the sample were totally dependent on their family to meet current educational expenses.

Study and reference research were the principal ways that the sample used the library (See Table 8). Fifty-three per cent of the sample used the library between one and three times a week; 33 per cent of the sample did not use the library at all (See Table 9).*

Students' conception of the library book theft phenomenon was measured by questions concerning students' perception of whether library book theft was right or wrong and students perception of consequences of library book theft, particularly students' estimates of the financial loss due to library book theft. Forty-seven per cent of the sample viewed book theft as illegal and indicated they felt people apprehended should be punished. However, when given hypothetical vignettes (see Appendix A) of students stealing library books for a variety of reasons the punishments they selected were not severe.** Furthermore,

---

* People seemed to interpret this question as referring to habitual use of the library. In other words, students who say they used the library zero times a week did not seem to be saying that they never used the library; the answers to other questions concerning library use indicate that these people did not consistently use the library.

** Seventy-eight per cent of those answering the library study questionnaire in 1974 defined library book theft as illegal. While 44 per cent of the people in the 73 study felt the individual stealing did not think this behavior was wrong, only 29 per cent of the respondents in the 74 study felt this way (Ohio State Librarians forthcoming).

The responses to this question may be biased by the fact that the wording on pages previous to the one in which this question appear gave the impression that the researcher thought library book theft was wrong. This could have suggested to the respondent that library book theft is wrong.

Definition of book theft is affected by library use. Those who used the library primarily for reference work were not as severe in the degree of badness they assigned to library book theft.

TABLE 8

Respondent's Reasons for Using the Library

	Per Cent	Number
Study	63.0	(241)
Reference	65.0	(246)
Study only during midterms and finals	16.0	(63)
Leisure reading	21.0	(79)
Missing		(19)
Total		380

TABLE 9

Frequency of Respondent's Library Use Per Week

	Per Cent	Number
Zero times	33.2	(126)
One to three times	53.2	(202)
Four to five times	8.4	(34)
More than six times	4.2	(16)
Missing		(2)
Total	100.0	380

TABLE 10

Respondent's Perception of Best Friend's Opinion of Library Book Theft

	Per Cent	Number
Strongly approve	0.0	(0)
Approve	2.1	(8)
Uncertain	33.1	(125)
Disapprove	42.3	(160)
Strongly disapprove	22.5	(85)
Missing		(2)
Total	100.0	380

TABLE 11

Respondent's Perception of Parent's Opinion to Library Book Theft

	Per Cent	Number
Strongly approve	1.1	(4)
Approve	0.5	(2)
Uncertain	6.4	(24)
Disapprove	36.2	(136)
Strongly disapprove	55.0	(210)
Missing		(4)
Total	100.0	380

students believe their best friend was more uncertain about approving or disapproving library book theft than their parents. Only 22 per cent of the sample percieved their "best friend" as strongly disapproving of book theft, while 56 per cent of the sample perceived their parents as strongly disapproving of the act. Seventy-four per cent of the students cited depriving other patrons of the book as the worst consequence of library book theft. This is similar to the results found by Reneker (1970) in her study of librarians and almost identical to The Ohio State University librarian study. Finally, the average of the students' estimate of the dollar loss due to book theft at The Ohio State University in 1975 was $55,880.* This is close to the $64,000 estimate made by librarians at The Ohio State University made in 1972.

In summary, students perceived library book theft as a problem and, at least financially, a rather serious one. Students felt library book theft deserves punishment, but the majority of these students chose a punishment which would hinder specifically the academic pursuits rather than the entire life of the book thief. The choice of punishment by the student combined with the fact that students perceive harm done by book theft as deprivation of the academic community of its resources indicates that students view book theft as an academic crime only.

---

* Although some people interpreted the question to deal with average value of the book the person stole, and others the average value of a book, the average response was $4.80. The average value of a book is $14.00 (Gapan, 1975).

The data for Table 12 was ascertained by asking students what motivations they perceived people had when they stole books. As Table 12 indicates, no one motivation to steal books clearly dominates the others. The most strongly supported motivations are those dealing with material deprivation. The high cost of xeroxing and inadequate funds to purchase books were thought by respondents to be frequent motivations for book theft. The perceived high cost of xeroxing is affected by library use. People who use the library to study and for reference materials more often felt that the high cost of xeroxing is important. Twenty per cent of the students felt people frequently steal books in protest against The Ohio State University. Seventeen per cent felt challenge was a frequent motivation of stealing books. A small portion of the total sample felt that pressure to receive good grades or stiff competition among peers was a possible motivation for those who steal books. This finding reflects the rather unlikely attitude that students are not conscious of competition or the more likely attitude that students do not think having extra library resources is an aid in managing the competition peers present.

TABLE 12

Reasons Given By Respondents As to Why Students Steal Library Books

		Per Cent	Number
Xeroxing is too expensive**#	Often	30.3	(115)
	Sometimes	43.4	(165)
	Rarely	26.3	(100)
Cannot afford to buy book for a course or project	Often	27.4	(104)
	Sometimes	51.5	(195)
	Rarely	21.1	(80)
Not enoubh time to use book in the library	Often	26.2	(99)
	Sometimes	47.6	(180)
	Rarely	26.2	(99)
As protest against OSU because OSU is like a "big business"***	Often	20.1	(76)
	Sometimes	35.1	(133)
	Rarely	44.9	(171)
As a challenge	Often	16.6	(63)
	Sometimes	38.2	(145)
	Rarely	45.3	(172)
Extra text will help to relieve pressure of getting good grades	Often	14.2	(54)
	Sometimes	45.4	(172)
	Rarely	40.4	(163)
Stiff competition	Often	4.5	(36)
	Sometimes	35.4	(134)
	Rarely	55.1	(209)
Total (of each category)		*	(380)

* The rate of missing answers ranged from 0 to 1. The index of dispersion ranged from 84 to 98 per cent. Because the difference between each category is small the data was presented in this manner. This procedure will be followed in the subsequent tables of this nature.

** The pressure to get good grades was rated by 30 per cent of those people completing the library study in 1974 as a possible motivation to get good grades. Eight per cent in 1973 and 26 per cent in 1974 of the respective library studies said that photocopying played a part in library book theft. In the library's study they found that 19 per cent in 1973 and 5 per cent in 1974 thought a person took books in order to be part of a group or to gain status they found 25 per cent in 1973 and 17 per cent in 1974 thought people take books because of the challenge. (Ohio State University Librarians).

*** Although the relationship between field of study and pressure is not significant, arts and humanities students felt less pressured; social science majors, the most. Juniors were the most pressured among class ranks.

Although the relationship is not significant, majors in the college of education seemed to feel stiff competition the last; professional, social science and business the same. Juniors felt stiff competition the most among class ranks.

These categories are similarly worded to those on the questionnaire.

Given the distribution in Table 13, students felt carrying out a book in a purse or satchel was the most common technique for stealing a book. Twenty-one per cent of the sample felt the most common technique of stealing books was hiding in clothing. The distribution of other answers dealing with factors affecting the procedure involved book theft are more skewed. Students felt that stealers develop their own methods to steal books for the most part (see Table 14). This belief is consistent with belief held by 81 per cent of the students that book theft is a spontaneous act (See Table 15). People perceive less risk in stealing from large libraries (See Table 16). Seventy-nine per cent of the students did not perceive the type of library affecting the amount of guilt a person felt when he or she stole a book. However, of those who did perceive the type of library as affecting the amount of guilt a person felt, (15 per cent) said that they would feel less guilty stealing from the main library (See Table 17).

Table 18 lists how students rated each method for curbing book theft. Fifty-one per cent felt electronic devices were effective. Thirty-three per cent of the sample felt fines were an effective method for curbing book theft. Those who viewed fines as effective were more punitive in responses to the vignettes. Still, when students were asked to choose an appropriate punishment they chose to take library privileges away for a year (See

TABLE 13

Respondent's Opinion of How Books Are Stolen

	Per Cent	Number
Writing in False Date	8.1	(28)
Hiding in clothing	21.4	(74)
Carrying in purse or satchel	57.5	(199)
Other: hide in another book, throw out the window, etc.	13.0	(45)
Missing		(4)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = carrying in purse or satchel
Index of Dispersion = 80%

TABLE 14

Respondent's Opinion of Methods Learned From Friends

	Per Cent	Number
Learned from friends	24.6	(89)
Develop by themselves	70.4	(255)
Both	5.0	(18)
Missing		(18)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = develop own method
Index of Dispersion = 66%

TABLE 15

Respondent's Opinion on Planning Theft

	Per Cent	Number
Spontaneous	80.6	(295)
Planned	18.6	(68)
Both	0.8	(3)
Missing		(14)
Total	100.0	(380)

Mode = spontaneous
Index of Dispersion = 47%

TABLE 16

Respondent's Perception of Risk at Large vs Small Library

	Per Cent	Number
Large library	72.3	(256)
Small library	27.4	(97)
Missing		(26)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = Large Library
Index of Dispersion = 80%

TABLE 17

Respondent's Perception of Guilt Stealing from Different Types of Libraries

	Per Cent	Number
Department Library	4.2	(15)
Main Library	14.6	(52)
Reference	2.0	(7)
All equally	43.4	(155)
None of them	35.9	(128)
Missing		(23)
Total	100.0	380

TABLE 18

Respondent's Opinion on Ways to Curb Book Theft

		Per Cent	Number
Electronic devices**	Effective	51.4	(190)
	Somewhat Effective	43.2	(160)
	Ineffective	5.4	(20)
Heavily fine	Effective	32.6	(123)
	Somewhat Effective	43.2	(163)
	Ineffective	24.1	(91)
Have more xeroxing machines	Effective	22.4	(84)
	Somewhat Effective	42.1	(158)
	Ineffective	35.5	(133)
Student security guard	Effective	18.6	(70)
	Somewhat Effective	45.7	(172)
	Ineffective	35.6	(134)
Publicity campaign	Effective	7.2	(27)
	Somewhat Effective	40.6	(153)
	Ineffective	52.3	(197)
*Total (of each category)		100.0	380

* The missing rate ranged from 1 to 3 people; the index of dispersion ranged from 82 to 97 per cent.

** Exit guards were rated as 30 per cent in 1973 and 18 per cent effective in 1974; publicity campaigns- 21 per cent in 1973 and 11 per cent in 1974 in the study by the librarians at Ohio State University. They also found that 56 per cent in 1973 and 98 per cent in 1974 thought electronic devices to be effective in curbing book theft. It seems that this opinion varies with whether an electronic device has been installed in the respective library. While 98 per cent of the students in Commerce Library thought an electronic device would be effective, only 36 per cent of those in the Bio-Science Library thought it was important. Commerce Library obtained Check Point in that year, while Bio-Sciences was without such a device.

Tables 19 and 20). Although the cost of xeroxing was reported as being a frequent motivation for book theft, having more xeroxing machines was viewed by only 22 per cent of the total sample as effective. This suggests that the availability of xeroxing machines is not as important as the cost of the xeroxing. Last, publicity campaigns and student security guards are considered ineffective.

Book Thieves Opinion

Five per cent of the sample reported stealing books. On the average stealers said they stole three books.*,** Although estimates of book loss are rough, the estimates of The Ohio State University librarians and the estimations made from the data of this study coincide to some degree. Given that the actual average worth of a book is $14.00, the loss due to book theft may range from $35,000 to $105,000 per year.*** Although the larger estimate is larger than the librarians' estimate of $64,000 it is less

---

* No time boundaries were given for this question. Consequently, students could have meant they stole a certain amount of books in one year or in their entire experience at The Ohio State University.

** Respondents interpreted the question dealing with what a person does with a stolen book in many ways. Still of the minority who selected an alternative, 18 per cent said they would return the book eventually, 5 per cent said they would keep it for a collection, 0.4 per cent said they would sell it. 5 per cent said they would forget about the book and with time keep it. Fourteen of the 19 stealers said they returned the book eventually.

*** The estimations in this study were made by multiplying 5 per cent of The Ohio State University population times $14.00 times one times three books to get range.

TABLE 19

Respondent's Choice of Punishment for a Book Thief who was a Pre-med Student and whose Motivation was to Prevent Others from Using the Book

	Per Cent	Number
No penalty*	1.1	(4)
Told to return the book and lectured by the librarian	15.3	(56)
Take away library privileges for a year	62.0	(227)
Five days in jail and $50 fine	16.9	(62)
Six months in jail and $1,000 fine	4.6	(17)
Missing		(1)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = Take away library privileges for a year
Index of Dispersion = 70%

* Six people mentioned that they could not find the appropriate answer among these categories.

TABLE 20

Respondent's Choice of Punishment for a Book Thief Whose Motivation was to Fulfill a Material Need

	Per Cent	Number
No penalty	2.7	(10)
Told to return the book and lectured by the librarian	32.9	(120)
Take away library privileges for a year	50.4	(184)
Five days in jail and $50 fine	9.9	(36)
Six months in jail and $1,000 fine	4.1	(15)
Missing		(15)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = take away library privileges for a year
Index of Dispersion = 78%

TABLE 21

Stealer's Field of Study

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Professional and preprofessional	16.7	(3)*	22.0	(81)
Agriculture, home economics and natural resources	5.6	(1)	14.7	(54)
Social and behavioral sciences	11.1	(2)	14.1	(52)
Arts and humanities	38.9	(7)	13.5	(50)
Biological and physical sciences	0	(0)	6.8	(25)
Business Administration	16.7	(3)	10.1	(37)
College of education	5.6	(1)	7.9	(29)
University College or general studies	5.6	(1)	10.6	(30)
Missing		(1)		(12)
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 10.75819$
df = 6

sign = 0.0961

Cramer's V = 0.17215

TABLE 22 (continued)

* When less than five cases were in one cell the x^2 was corrected using Fisher's exact test. Subsequent tables with less than five cases in one cell will be corrected by Fisher's exact test.

TABLE 22

Stealer's Class Rank

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Graduate, professional or continuing education	5.0	(1)	7.5	(28)
Seniors	31.0	(6)	19.6	(74)
Juniors	26.0	(5)	31.8	(120)
Sophomores	15.7	(3)	26.0	(98)
Freshmen	21.0	(4)	15.1	(57)
Missing		0		3
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 9.64461$
df = 8
sign = 0.2909
Cramer's V = 0.16080

TABLE 23

Stealer's Sex

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Male	52.6	(10)	51.6	(195)
Female	47.4	(9)	48.4	(182)
Missing		0		4
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 0.01488$
df = 1
sign = 0.9042
phi = 0.00598

than the $140,000 estimation made based on The Ohio State University Library statistician's figures. Both of the librarians' figures were calculated using 1972 data.*

For the most part the demographic characteristics and opinions of those who admitted to book theft did not differ markedly from those who did not report book theft.** Because the sample of book thieves is small, their opinions and characteristics will be presented in full. Special note will be made of the significant differences between the total sample and the book thieves.

While occupation and education are significantly related to each other, only the relationship between occupation and those who steal books was significant (See Tables 24 and 25). In general, more of the principal wage earners in the families of those who admitted to book theft were unskilled, unemployed, or receiving some type of

---

* Students were asked if their best friend stole books; the researcher's intention was to compare this rate to the self-report rate. However, although the relationship between the two is significant at the 0.0001 level, the responses of the self reporters are seldom parallel to responses of those who admitted their best friend stole books. The discrepancy may be a result of a small sample in both cases. Consequently the analysis of questions and how those who reported their best friend stealing books will not be presented. The researcher, perplexed by this problem, interviewed 15 library patrons concerning the question to determine how they would answer the question of their best friend stolen books as they would if the question concerned their own behavior. Most of the respondents said they would. Of the 5 who admitted their best friend stole books, 4 reported they answered the question as themselves.

** Although no study has been made, a review of Director's Annual Report 73-74 and 74-75 indicates that the book loss rate has stabilized around this figure.

TABLE 24

Occupation of the Principal Wage Earner in Stealer's Family

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Major Professional	13.3	(2)	22.9	(76)
Medium professional	33.3	(5)	33.2	(110)
Semi-professional and farmers	0	(0)	11.1	(27)
Technical and clerical	26.7	(5)	23.7	(90)
Unemployed receiving some sort of government benefits	20.0	(3)	8.4	(28)
Missing		4		35
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 25.30614
df = 6
sign = 6.0003
Cramer's V = 0.3

TABLE 25

Stealer's Family Combined Income

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Greater than $25,000	5.8	(1)	26.4	(193)
$15,000 = 24,999	35.3	(6)	34.4	(121)
$10,000 = 14,999	41.1	(7)	27.3	(96)
$ 5,000 = 9,999	11.8	(2)	9.4	(33)
less than $4,999	5.8	(1)	2.6	(9)
Missing		2		28
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 4.93149
Df = 4
sign = 0.2944
Cramer's V = 0.11870

government benefit and fewer were major professionals. Accordingly, the income of these families was lower but not significantly lower than that of the total sample. Forty-two per cent of the stealers' families as compared to 27 per cent of the non stealers' families earned between $10,000 and $14,999 annually; 6 per cent of the stealers as compared to 26 per cent of the non stealers' families earned $25,000 a year or more (See Table 26). Other relationships are of interest. First, a greater per cent of stealers did not receive help to meet their current educational expenses from their parents. Second, the most frequent book theives were arts and humanities students (See Table 27). Third, stealers did not seem to come from a particular class rank. Fourth, a greater proportion of stealers used the library for leisure reading and study during midterms and finals, while frequency of library use did not seem to differ between the two groups (See Tables 28 and 29). Finally, although Poland (1971) hypothesized that men steal more frequently than women, 53 per cent of the men and 47 per cent of the women reported book theft in this study (See Table 23).

Like the total sample, the overwhelming majority of book thieves felt book theft was wrong. However, most stealers did not feel the act was as worthy of punishment as the total sample did. Like the total sample, the stealers felt the most appropriate punishment in the

TABLE 26

Education of Principal Wage Earner in Stealer's Family

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Graduate or professional training	12.5	(2)	17.8	(62)
College education	18.8	(3)	25.8	(90)
Vocational or up to three years of college	31.3	(5)	18.6	(65)
High school or less	37.6	(6)	37.7	(132)
Missing		3		31
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 2.70010$
df = 6
sign = 0.8454
Cramer's V =0.08821

TABLE 27

Percentage of Stealer's Current Educational Expenses Paid for by His or Her Family

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Zero per cent	44.4	(8)	34.6	(129)
Twenty-five per cent	11.1	(2)	15.3	(57)
Fifty per cent	22.2	(4)	11.3	(42)
Seventy-five per cent	11.1	(2)	17.7	(66)
One hundred per cent	11.1	(1)	21.2	(79)
Missing		2		4
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 4.19189$
df = 4
sign = 0.3807
Cramer's V = 0.10644

TABLE 28

Type of Stealer's Library Use

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Study	47.0	(9)	63.0	(251)
Reference	74.0	(14)	65.0	(246)
Study only during midterms and finals	37.0	(7)	16.0	(63)
Leisure reading	47.0	(9)	21.0	(79)
Missing				19
Total	*	19	100.0	389

$x^2 = 61.49042$
df = 20
sign = 0.0001
Cramer's V = 0.4

* Same format as Table 8.

TABLE 29

Stealer's Frequency of Library Use

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Few times	94.4	(17)	86.4	(328)
Many times	5.6	(1)	13.1	(50)
Missing		1		2
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 0.42413$
df = 1
sign = 0.5149
phi = 0.05213

hypothetical vignettes was taking away library privileges for a year (See Tables 39 and 40). Sixty-seven per cent of the stealers felt depriving other patrons of the book was the worst consequence of library book theft. The mean of the stealers' estimate of dollar loss due to library book theft per year was $17,700.

Stealers' perception of how their "best friend" and how their parents felt about book theft was significantly different from the general sample (See Tables 30 and 31). Although the stealers perceived their "best friends" and parents as not necessarily approving of book theft, they certainly thought they were less disapproving than the total sample did. A greater number of stealers were uncertain of how their "best friend" would perceive library book theft than the total sample. This suggests that Cameron's hypothesis that stealers have some group support is applicable to book theft.

In summary, like the general sample stealers viewed library book theft as an academic crime. They differed in that they did not feel the crime is as "bad."

As the data in Table 32 shows, stealers cited not being able to afford a book as a frequent motivation for stealing more often than the total sample did. Thirty-two per cent of the stealers felt not having enough time for book use in the library was a frequent cause of book theft. Twenty-six per cent of the stealers and 22 per

TABLE 30

Stealer's Perception of "Best Friends'" Opinion of Book Theft

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Strongly Approve	0	(0)	0	(0)
Approve	0	(0)	2.1	(8)
Uncertain	61.0	(11)	33.1	(125)
Disapprove	16.7	(3)	42.3	(160)
Strongly disapprove	22.2	(4)	22.5	(85)
Missing		1		2
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 8.16823
df = 3
sign = 0.0427
Cramer's V = 0.14818

TABLE 31

Stealer's Perception of Parent's Opinion of Book Theft

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Strongly approve	0	0	1.1	(4)
Approve	5.6	1	0.5	(2)
Uncertain	22.2	4	6.4	(24)
Disapprove	50.0	9	36.2	(136)
Strongly disapprove	22.2	4	44.0	(210)
Missing		1		4
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 21.73642
df = 4
sign = 0.0002
Cramer's V = 0.24237

TABLE 32

Stealer's Opinions on Motivation's For Book Theft

		Stealers		Total Sample	
		Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Xeroxing is too expensive	Often	15.8	(3)	30.3	(115)
	Sometimes	47.4	(9)	43.4	(165)
	Rarely	36.8	(7)	26.3	(100)
Cannot afford to buy a book for course or project	Often*	42.1	(8)	27.4	(104)
	Rarely	57.9	(11)	72.6	(275)
Not enough time to use book in library	Often	31.6	(6)	26.2	(99)
	Sometimes	47.4	(9)	47.6	(180)
	Rarely	21.1	(4)	26.2	(99)
As a protest against OSU because OSU is like a "big business"	Often	15.6	(3)	20.1	(76)
	Rarely	84.2	(16)	80.0	(304)
As a challenge	Often	21.1	(4)	16.6	(63)
	Sometimes	31.6	(6)	38.2	(145)
	Rarely	47.4	(9)	45.3	(172)
Extra text will help to relieve pressure of getting good grades	Often	26.3	(5)	14.2	(54)
	Rarely	73.7	(14)	85.8	(325)
Stiff competition	Often	22.2	(4)	9.5	(36)
	Rarely	74.8	(14)	90.5	(343)
Total (of each category)		100.0	19	100.0	380

TABLE 32 (continued)

* Some responses were reclassified in a way that most accurately reflected the initial answer. For example, since most people answered question 18 as morally wrong the question was recoded in 2 categories: those who said it was ok and those who said it was not. If this more simplified comparison yielded a significant relationship more detailed analysis could be done. This process of reclassifying was done here and in subsequent tables.

cent of the stealers respectively said an extra text would relieve the pressure of getting good grades and keeping a text would reduce stiff competition. Sixteen per cent of the stealers cited protest against The Ohio State University as a frequent motivation for book theft.

Like the total sample, 56 per cent of the stealers felt carrying a book in a purse or satchel was the method for stealing books (See Table 33). Sixty-seven per cent felt book theft was a spontaneous act (See Table 35). Seventy-two per cent of the stealers said they develop methods to steal books by themselves. However the stealers did not perceive the factors of "least risk" and "least evil" as Smigel (1972) hypothesized. Unlike the general sample, little difference in risk from stealing from a large or small library was perceived by the stealers. Stealers and non-stealers differed significantly in their conception of guilt as resulting from stealing different types of libraries. Although non-stealers would feel less guilty stealing from the main library, stealers would feel less guilty stealing from a department library. Also, not one book thief chose to steal from the reference room (See Tables 36 and 37).

Students in the total sample and students who admitted to book theft viewed curbs to booktheft in similar ways (See Table 38). Sixty-eight per cent of the stealers answering felt electronic devices were an

TABLE 33

Stealer's Opinion of How Books Are Stolen

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Writing in false date	11.1	(2)	8.1	(28)
Hiding in clothing	16.7	(3)	21.4	(74)
Carrying in purse or satchel	56.5	(10)	57.5	(199)
Other	16.7	(3)	13.0	(45)
Missing		1		
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 0.53613
df = 3
sign = 0.9109
Cramer's V = 0.03971

TABLE 34

Stealers' Opinion If Methods Are Learned From Friends

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Learn from friend	27.8	(5)	24.6	(89)
Develop methods by themselves	72.2	(13)	70.4	(255)
Both	0	(0)	5.0	(18)
Missing		1		18
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 1.03045$
df = 2
sign = 0.5976
Cramer's V = 0.05373

TABLE 35

Stealer's Opinion on Planning Book Theft

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Spontaneous	66.7	(12)	80.6	(295)
Planned	33.3	(6)	18.6	(68)
Both	0	0	0.8	(14)
Missing		1		
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 2.68804$
df = 2
sign = 0.0208
Cramer's V = 0.08691

TABLE 36

Stealer's Perception of Risk at Large vs Small Library

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Larger Library	52.7	(10)	72.3	(256)
Small Library	47.3	(9)	27.4	(97)
Missing				26
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 21.73119$
df = 3
sign = 0.0001
Cramer's V = 0.25

TABLE 37

Stealer's Perception of Guilt From Different Libraries

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Department Library	26.3	(5)	4.2	(15)
Main Library	5.3	(1)	14.6	(52)
Reference	0	(0)	2.0	(7)
All equally	42.1	(8)	43.4	(155)
None of them	26.3	(5)	35.9	(128)
Missing				23
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 24.92303$
df = 7
sign = 0.0001
Cramer's V = 0.26

TABLE 38

Stealer's Opinion on Ways to Curb Theft

		Stealer's		Total Sample	
		Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Electronic devices	Effective	58.4	(13)	51.4	(190)
	Somewhat effective	21.1	(4)	43.2	(160)
	Ineffective	10.5	(2)	5.4	(20)
Heavily fine	Effective	36.8	(7)	32.6	(123)
	Ineffective	63.2	(12)	67.3	(254)
Have more xeroxing machines	Effective	21.1	(4)	22.4	(84)
	Somewhat effective	26.3	(5)	42.1	(158)
	Ineffective	52.6	(10)	35.5	(133)
Student security quard	Effective	15.8	(3)	18.6	(70)
	Somewhat effective	26.3	(5)	45.7	(172)
	Ineffective	57.9	(11)	35.6	(134)
Publicity campaign	Effective	15.8	(3)	7.2	(27)
	Somewhat effective	47.4	(9)	40.6	(153)
	Ineffective	36.8	(7)	52.3	(197)
Total (of each category)		*	19	100.0	380

TABLE 38 (continued)

* Table 38 is presented in the same manner as Table 18.

effective means of curbing book theft. In addition, although the stealers were not as stringent in their view of "badness" as the total sample, stealers and non-stealers chose almost equal punishments given the hypothetical vignettes (See Tables 39 and 40). Thirty-seven per cent of the stealers felt heavy fines would be effective. Like the general sample, stealers did not feel a student security guard or conducting a publicity campaign were effective means to limit book theft.

In sum the differences between the stealers and non-stealers were: occupational level was significantly lower than that represented in the total sample, stealers did not define the "badness" of library book theft as rigidly as did the total sample, stealers' perception of how their "best friends" and parents viewed the act was not as negative as was the perception of the total sample's "best friends" and parents and finally, stealers did not feel there was less risk in stealing from a large library as the majority of the total sample did nor did they feel less guilty stealing from a larger library as the majority of the total sample did.

Hypotheses and Frameworks

The third section of this chapter will discuss the extent to which the research supported the hypotheses

TABLE 39

Stealer's Choice of Punishment for Book Thief who was a Pre-Med Student and Whose Motivation was to Prevent Others Using the Book

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
No Penalty	5.3	(1)	1.1	(4)
Told to return the book and lectured by the librarian	15.8	(3)	15.3	(56)
Take away library privileges for a year	68.4	(13)	62.0	(227)
Five days in jail and $50 fine	10.5	(2)	16.9	(62)
Six months in jail and $1,000 fine	0	(0)	4.6	(17)
Missing		1		1
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 4.7335$
df = 4
sign = 0.3158
Cramer's V = 0.11467

TABLE 40

Stealer's Choice of Punishment of Book Thief Whose Motivation was to Fulfill a Material Need

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
No penalty	5.6	(1)	2.7	(10)
Told to return book and lectured by Librarian	27.8	(5)	32.9	(120)
Take away library privileges for a year	50.0	(9)	50.4	(184)
Five days in jail and $50 fine	16.7	(3)	9.9	(36)
Six months in jail and $1,000 fine	0	(0)	4.1	(12)
Missing		1		15
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 2.26407
df = 7
sign = 0.6864
Cramer's V = 0.07950

outlined in Chapter II.* The four division of hypotheses that will be discussed are: library book theft as a protest against bureaucracy, library book theft as a form of kicks, library book theft as gang behavior, and library book theft as white collar crime.

The Ohio State University was viewed by most students as bureaucratic.** However the only measure dealing with bureaucratic factors which was significantly related with all other tested components of the hypothesis that stealing is in protest against "big business" was whether students think they have a say in university policy. This measure is similar to Stern's measure of "low student dignity" (Stern, 1966). Furthermore, while Smigel's hypothesis about "least risk" was supported by the opinions of the total sample, stealers were equally divided on the issue. Only 21 per cent of the total respondents felt stealing from the main library compared to a department library made a difference in guilt. Thirty-one per cent of the stealers felt there was a difference in guilt. Students did not think protest against The Ohio State University because it is like "big business" was strong motivation for book theft. Although people perceive The Ohio State University as bureaucratic, this does not appear to stimulate library book theft.

---

* Specific components of the library book theft phenomenon will be considered in the discussion of the literature from which they were derived. In addition, these factors will be compared to various components of each hypothesis to see if they are significantly related. As described in Chapter III, chi-square was used to determine if the components were significantly related at the 0.05 level.

** Although 74 per cent liked The Ohio State University educational system and 46 per cent felt that the university administration seemed to care about the rights and privileges of the students, only 10 per cent felt there was little red tape at The Ohio State University and only 12 per cent felt they had a say in university policy. Book thieves liked The Ohio State University educational system less than did non-book thieves. Three-fourths of

Although the hypotheses of Poland and Lunden were not explored fully, the findings of this study indicate that their hypotheses do not apply to library book theft. Few of the total sample and even fewer of the stealers felt kicks was a motivation for library book theft. Similarly, Poland's (1971) hypothesis that book theft is a gang type of behavior was unsupported in this research as it was in his own study. Despite the fact that stealers and non-stealers view book theft as wrong, a greater portion of non stealers felt the act was illegal and should be punished. Furthermore, stealers were uncertain about how their friends viewed book theft. It seems that it the act was a result of gang behavior, the participants would be certain of the opinions of their friends and that they would approve of the act. The

---

them felt the university did not care about student rights and privileges. The direction of the stealers in this study is the same direction of the opinions of stealers in Oliner's and Manuel's study (1975).

strongest indication that Poland's hypothesis is inappropriate is that only 25 per cent of the stealers said methods for stealing books were learned from their friends.

Like the other factors, not all the hypotheses derived from using the white collar crime perspective were supported by this study.*

People who admitted they stole books came from a slightly lower middle-class background compared to the middle-class background of the total sample. This relationship is logical, using the white collar perspective, given that the principal pressure motivating people to steal books was material deprivation.** Both stealers and non-stealers felt library book theft was wrong. But fewer stealers felt the act was illegal and deserved punishment.*** Perception of crime was significantly related with the perceived opinion of family and friends. A significantly greater proportion of the stealers were uncertain about the opinions of their friends and felt their parents' opinion was not as negative as the total sample perceived the opinion of their "best friend" and parents. In particular, the fact that the attitude of the "best friend" is uncertain and that the book thief develops methods on his own to steal makes the comparison between theft and shoplifting not as strong. Cameron (1964) has indicated that in-group instruction and group support are essentials of shoplifting.

---

* When typed, the question asking the respondent's grade point was omitted. This error was not discovered until the researcher began to analyze the data.

** A significant relationship existed between those who perceived material deprivation as a reason to steal books and those who were less severe in punishing the person represented in the hypothetical vignettes in which material deprivation was the reason.

*** Occupation of parent was significantly related to how a person perceived the severity of book theft. Medium and small professionals seemed less severe.

Implications of Findings

In sum, this research has clarified motivations leading to, methods of and ways to curb library book theft. It has pinpointed that the total sample perceived library book theft as wrong. In fact, almost one-half of the sample felt the act was illegal and should be punished. As expected stealers did not define act of book theft as negatively as the non-stealers. Even though fewer stealers than non-stealers felt library book theft was illegal and even fewer stealers than non-stealers felt library book theft was both illegal and that it should be punished, practically all of the stealers felt that book theft was wrong.

Just as there was a discrepancy in the degree of wrongness perceived by the stealers and non-stealers so is there a discrepancy between their estimates of dollar loss to the university due to library book theft, and between the stealers and non-stealers. The average estimate made by the total sample was $56,000. The average of the estimates made by stealers was $18,000. Still, to both stealers and non-stealers, book theft is wrong principally because it hinders the academic achievement of their fellow students. Consequently, the most appropriate punishment in the eyes of book thieves and non-book thieves is taking away library privileges for a year.

Furthermore this study indicates that material deprivation is the major motivation for stealing books. Neither stealers nor non-stealers were very supportive of the motivation derived from Oliner's and Manuel's hypothesis that book theft is done in protest against the university's bureaucracy and resemblance to "big business" nor of Lunden's hypothesis that book theft is done for kicks. Poland's hypothesis that theft among college students resembles gang behavior seems inappropriate with regards to book theft principally because book theft is a spontaneous act, using a method the thief develops himself.

Bureaucratic factors did not influence book theft. The total sample felt there was less risk in stealing from a large library than a small one, but stealers were equally divided about the issue. Furthermore, perception of guilt did not seem to play a major role in choice of location for library book theft. When a difference in guilt was perceived by the respondents, the stealers, unlike those in the total sample, perceived less guilt from stealing from department libraries than the main library.

Occupation of parent and use of library were the demographic variables which yielded a significant difference between stealers and non-stealers. Stealers were in the lower portion of middle-class categories than the the non-stealers which tends to explain material deprivation or relative deprivation which this research evidences as a major motivation for book theft. A greater portion of stealers were in the field of arts and humanities, and were dependent on themselves to meet current educational expenses. Demographic variables - class rank or field of study did not significantly affect the amount of academic pressure. However, a greater number of juniors said that the pressure of good grades and that stiff competition was a motivation for book theft. A greater number of social and behavioral science, professional and business administration students felt stiff competition was a motivation for book theft. Social and behavioral science students felt the pressure of good grades more than other fields.

Fifty-one per cent of the total sample and 68 per cent of the stealers felt electronic devices are effective means of curbing book theft. The effectiveness of electronic devices was supported not only by the opinion of the sample but by actual fact.* Publicity campaigns were not thought to be effective for the most part by the students Publicity campaigns have been shown only to be effective during the period in which they are being conducted (Gapan, 1976). Although both stealers and non-stealers thought books are taken by hiding them in clothing or putting them in a satchel or purse, student security guards were not thought to be an effective means of limiting book theft by the sample.

Given the factors affecting book theft, the researcher feels that the white collar crime perspective yields the best tool for analysis of this phenomenon. The fact that the stealers perceive their "best friends" as uncertain rather than approving of book theft makes the analogy with shoplifting not as strong. But the social class of the stealers and the motivation of material deprivation suggest that the white collar crime perspective is appropriate. In the sketch of white collar crime, it was hypothesized that patrons who steal books do so in response to academic pressure. If some of the pressures spurring library book theft come directly from the pressures as a student, this research did not clarify these pressures. Perhaps this is a possible research topic for educators.

---

* The Commerce Library has reported a drop in loss rate from 6 to 0.4 per cent (Smiley, 1975) since the installation of electronic devices.

For the most part, the opinions and demographic variables of stealers did not differ markedly from the non-stealers. When significant differences do occur, it is difficult to be sure if these differences are due to actual variation in the opinions of the stealers or if they are due to the small number of stealers in the sample.*

Suggestions For Further Research

Given the limitation and findings of this study the following suggested research projects may clarify the components of the library book theft phenomenon:

1. Examine the effect in attitude change produced by the introduction of electronic devices and questionnaires concerning book theft.
2. Study other library settings to find out if the problem and its consequences are perceived as in this research.
3. Interview book thieves to explore other motivations, methods of book theft, and the degree and nature of group support.
4. Examine book theft at small universities to recheck the idea that theft may be affected by size. This may also be a way of testing how bureaucracy affects book theft.
5. Examine the attitudes towards book theft in other large universities either where the students are more politically inclined or where the university is not as well organized as The Ohio State University.

---

* As noted in the section discussing book thieves' opinions, although the number of book thieves was small, it seems to be somewhat reasonable considering the estimates of book loss.

6. Obtain a larger sample of book thieves, perhaps by sampling in libraries, to see if the perceived attitudes and participation in library book theft are similar to those who admitted book theft as originally hypothesized in this research.

7. Explore grade point as an intervening variable in academic pressure.

8. Examine type of books stolen in greater detail.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER IV

Bureau of the Census
1972 Social and Economic Statistics United States Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.

Cameron, Mary
1964 Booster and the Snitch. London: Free Press of Glenco, Collier and Macmilliam Limited.

Gapan, Kaye
1975 interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Gapan, Kaye
1976 interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Hollingshead, August B.
1965 Two Factor Index of Social Positon. Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut.

Ohio State Librarians
Unpublished study.

The Ohio State University Poll
1974 Report on Student Usage. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Oliner, S.P. and Maurice, Manuel
1975 "Student Theft: Crime or Protest. Humboldt Journal of Social Relations.

Poland, Stephen
1971 "Characteristics Behavior, Attitudes of Male College Students Who Have Committed Theft." Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University.

Reneker, Maxine
1970 "Book Theft in Academic Libraries." Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1970.

Smigel, Erwin
1972 "Attitudes Towards Stealing Related to Size of Victim Organization." Crime Against Bureaucracy. ed. Erwin Smigel and L.T. Lawrence Ross, New York: Van Reinhold Co. pp. 15-27.

Smiley, Jackie
1975 interview held at The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio.

Stern, George
1966 Studies of College Environments. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 010647

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study has been to explore the motivations behind, the methods of, and the ways to curb library book theft at The Ohio State University. Four areas of the literature were drawn upon to guide the research. These areas dealt with library factors, bureaucratic factors, university setting factors, and white collar crime factors. Some hypotheses drawn from these include: electronic devices will curb book theft, people steal books in political protest against the university, size and purpose of library affects where book theft occurs, book thieves steal for kicks, book theft is a form of gang behavior, people steal books because of academic pressure and people are ambigous in their definition of book theft.

The case study method was used because this study was exploratory in nature. A questionnaire distributed in mass to nine classes at The Ohio State University served as the principal research tool. Three hundred and eighty questionnaires were analyzed. Nineteen of these were completed by book thieves. Book thieves were ascertained by self-reporting techniques. Chi-square was used to determine the significant differences between stealers and non-stealers. It was also used to determine independence between the components of the sets of hypotheses.

The sample was fairly representative of The Ohio State University student population of the fall of 1975. A proportionately greater number of juniors and seniors were included in the sample because they have been shown to use the library more frequently than underclassmen. The occupation of the stealers' parent and the type of library use were the only demographic variables on which stealers and non-stealers differ significantly. A greater proportion of the stealers in this study were arts and humanities students and were dependent on themselves to meet their current educational expenses. Motivations concerning material deprivation were most often thought by the sample to be frequent motivations for book theft. A greater portion of the stealers felt that stiff competition and pressure for getting "good" grades were frequent motivations for book theft than did the total sample. As described by the opinions of the sample, book theft appears to be a spontaneous act and the book thief develops his own methods for stealing books. The most common method appears to be carrying out the book in a purse or satchel. Stealers and non-stealers alike think electronic devices are an effective means for curbing book theft. Finally, this research does not support one set of hypotheses in its entirety. Although the sample viewed The Ohio State University as bureaucratic, students did not think that stealing books was done in protest against the university. Further, while the total sample perceived less risk stealing books from a large library, the stealers did not perceive a difference in risk between a large and a small library. Similarly, those in the total sample who perceived difference in guilt in stealing from different kinds of libraries said they would feel less guilty stealing from the main library. Conversely, the stealers said they would feel less guilty stealing from a department library. These findings contradict Smigel's (1970) hypotheses that people are more likely to steal from larger organizations.

In the same manner, the opinions of the stealers and non-stealers indicate that the motivation of kicks and book theft as a gang behavior are not applicable to the library book theft phenomenon. Lastly, this research suggests that book theft is a form of white collar crime. While material deprivation is considered a frequent motivation, the research did not identify the pressures that affect the person in his role as a student. Although the attitudes of the stealer, the stealers' "best friends" and parents appear to be significantly different from those of the total sample the attitudes are not supportive of book theft. For these people book theft is less "wrong" than for the total sample.

Finally, although the sample of stealers is small, it seems reasonable considering the estimations made by the librarians at The Ohio State University. If one combines the data librarians gathered in their 1973-75 study and the data of this research it appears the loss rate hovers around 10 per cent of students or approximately $70,000 worth of missing books.

In conclusion, this research has described the methods involved in, the considerations of, and the motivations behind library book theft on the basis of the opinions of stealers and non-stealers. The findings served to clarify some factors apparently not involved in book theft, namely kicks as a motivation and gang behavior as a form. Further, this research has suggested library book theft as a form of white collar crime. This research however, has contributed a description by participants in library book theft and by the students. In this way, this research has begun to fill the gap present in the literature on library book theft and has pointed the way for further research. Finally, this research may be used by librarians when they evaluate means to deter book theft. It may also aid librarians in determining the financial and circulation goals the library wants to meet. Although this study focused only on academic libraries, and it is not known if patrons of academic libraries are similar to library patrons outside the academic setting, the following discussion might also be useful to librarians outside the academic community.

The opinions of stealers and non-stealers alike, indicate that financial loss is not the most important consequence of library book theft. To these people, depriving other patrons of the library book is the worst consequence of this theft. It indeed may be that in an absolute sense stealing library books is as wrong as stealing any other item. Yet given the fact that students feel the most appropriate punishment is taking away library privileges for a year, it is questionable if publicly labeling library book theft as a crime would be acceptable by the academic community. While the threat of prosecution may deter the crime, employing the proper structure necessary to apprehend and prosecute students may be difficult.* For example, how would the university community feel about having police officers around the library and arresting book thieves? This research indicates that most students feel fines of $50.00 or more and jail sentences are inappropriate punishments. Further, it is doubtful police would give this crime high priority unless the university community strongly demanded it, if then.

---

* Not enough time has passed to evaluate the recent action of the library to use the Ohio Code.

Since this and other studies indicate that theft is a result of need perhaps the best solution to the book theft problem is to supply more books. The librarians and the community believe that a wide circulation is the most important function of the library. Perhaps then librarians should spend money that would go for security guards, turnstiles or electronic devices on extra copies of popular and current books. The researcher is not suggesting that eliminating protection devices would stop book theft. What the researcher is suggesting is that money spent on these devices might be better spent on buying multiple copies of frequently used books. While the cost may be the same, the potential for meeting the goal of wide circulation is greater. Further by concentrating on what books are most frequently used and wanted the librarians will be more concerned with fulfilling the needs of their patrons and the university community rather than limiting the opportunities for fulfilling those needs. Is that not what librarians should be concerned with in the first place?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

LIBRARY BOOK THEFT

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine some of the factors concerning library book loss at Ohio State. Please do NOT put your name on this questionnaire. Several steps are being taken to guarantee your anonymity. Since many of the questions concern attitudes, there are no necessarily right or wrong answers. Please answer each question as completely and honestly as possible.

These questions deal with your opinion and experience with book loss at the OSU libraries in the last year.

1. How often have you been able to find a book you wanted at OSU libraries within the last school year?
   - a. ___ 0 times
   - b. ___ 1-3 times
   - c. ___ 4-6 times
   - d. ___ more than 7 times

2. Do you think the principle reason could not find the book was...
   - a. ___ because you did not understand how to use the library system
   - b. ___ because the book was not listed in the card catalog
   - c. ___ because the book was mis-shelved
   - d. ___ because the book was stolen

3. What, in your opinion is the worst consequence of book theft?
   - a. ___ financial cost to the university
   - b. ___ inconvenience to the patron because the person wastes time
   - c. ___ it makes the person frustrated
   - d. ___ it deprives other patrons of the use of the book

4. What do you estimate is the dollar loss to Ohio State University each year because ob book theft? ______________________

How effective or ineffective would each of the following techniques be in curbing book theft?

5. To install electronic devices like Check Point in the Commerce Library
a. ___ effective
b. ___ somewhat effective
c. ___ ineffective

6. To have a student security guard at the exit.
a. ___ effective
b. ___ somewhat effective
c. ___ ineffective

7. To heavily fine ($15.00 or more) anyone apprehended for stealing a book
a. ___ effective
b. ___ somewhat effective
c. ___ ineffective

8. To have more xeroxing machines
a. ___ effective
b. ___ somewhat effective
c. ___ ineffective

9. To have a publicity campaign explaining the bad consequences of book theft
a. ___ effective
b. ___ somewhat effective
c. ___ ineffective

NEXT, These questions are designed to tap your opinion on why people steal books.

People steal books because ...

10. They feel they don't have enough time to use the books in the library
a. ___ often
b. ___ sometimes
c. ___ rarely

11. They cannot afford to buy a book for a course or project
a. ___ often
b. ___ sometimes
c. ___ rarely

12. They feel pressured to get good grades and feel an extra reference or text will get them a better grade
a. ___ often
b. ___ sometimes
c. ___ rarely

13. Xeroxing is too expensiv
a. ___ often
b. ___ sometimes
c. ___ rarely

14. It serves as a protest against OSU. They think OSU is like "big business"

a. ___ often
b. ___ sometimes
c. ___ rarely

15. To see whether they can outsmart the library personnel

a. ___ often
b. ___ sometimes
c. ___ rarely

16. Competition is stiff and they want to make sure no one else uses the book

a. ___ often
b. ___ sometimes
c. ___ rarely

17. How many books has your best friend taken?

____

18. Library book theft is...

a. ___ ok because books are part of the learning resources of the university and belong to the student
b. ___ morally wrong
c. ___ illegal
d. ___ illegal and should be punished

19. How many times a week do you use the OSU library system?

a. ___ 0 times
b. ___ 1-3 times
c. ___ 4-5 times
d. ___ more than 6 times

20. (Check as many as apply) I use the library...

a. ___ to study
b. ___ to use reference books and research materials
c. ___ to study only during midterms and finals
d. ___ for leisure reading

Please select the one best response for people in each of the following situations

21. The book thief is a pre-med student whose motive is to keep a chemistry text so none of the person's fellow students could use it

a. ___ no penalty
b. ___ told to return the book and then lectured by a librarian on the evils of book theft
c. ___ take away the person's library privileges for a year
d. ___ 5 days in jail and $50 fine

e. ___ 6 months in jail and $1,000 fine

22. The book thief is a person whose father earns less than $10,000 a year The thief steals a text. and reference books to study for a history test.

a. ___ no penalty
b. ___ told to return the book and then lectured by a librarian on the evils of book theft
c. ___ take away the person's library privileges for a year
d. ___ 5 days in jail and $50 fine
e. ___ 6 months in jail and $1,000 fine

23. How would your best friend react to someone who stole a book from the library?

a. ___ strongly approve
b. ___ approve
c. ___ uncertain
d. ___ disapprove
e. ___ strongly disapprove

How would your family?

a. ___ strongly approve
b. ___ approve
c. ___ uncertain
d. ___ disapprove
e. ___ strongly disapprove

24. If you were to steal a book which method would you use?

a. ___ writing in a false date
b. ___ hiding in clothing
c. ___ carrying in purse or satchel
d. ___ other; please specify

25. Do you think people generally...

a. ___ spontaneously decide to take a book
b. ___ plan to take a book before they use the library that day or night

26. Do you think people...

a. ___ learn from their friends how to take books
OR
b. ___ develop methods to take books by themselves

NOW, These questions deal with characteristics of people filling out this questionnaire

27. What is your sex?
    a. ___ male
    b. ___ female

28. What is the occupation of your parents who contributes the most to your family's income? Please list the exact title, his or her responsibilities.

    ____

    What is his or her highest level of education?

    ____

    Your family's combined income is

    a. ___ less than $5,000 a year
    b. ___ $ 5,000 - $ 9,999 a year
    c. ___ $10,000 - $14,999 a year
    d. ___ $15,000 - $24,999 a year
    e. ___ $25,000 or more a year

    How much of your living and school expenses does your family pay for?

    a. ___ 0%
    b. ___ 25%
    c. ___ 50%
    d. ___ 75%
    e. ___ 100%

29. What is your major (department)? ______________________

30. What is your class rank?
    a. ___ first quarter freshman
    b. ___ freshman
    c. ___ sophomore
    d. ___ junior
    e. ___ senior
    f. ___ graduate (Master's level)
    g. ___ graduate (Ph.D. level)
    h. ___ professional, please specify
    i. ___ other, please specify

31. How many books have you ever stolen (borrowed without letting the library know) from the OSU libraries?

    ____

    Please estimate the average value of each book

    ____

32. If you stole a book (borrowed without letting the library know) what did you do with it?
- a. ___ return it eventually
- b. ___ keep it for a collection
- c. ___ sell it
- d. ___ forget about the book and with time keep it
- e. ___ didn't steal the book

33. Do you think there is less risk stealing a book from a ...
- a. ___ large library at OSU
- b. ___ small library at OSU

34. Would you feel less guilty stealing a book from ...
- a. ___ your department's library
- b. ___ the main library
- c. ___ the reference room
- d. ___ all equally
- e. ___ none of them

35. Would you recommend to your best friend to attend OSU?
- a. ___ yes
- b. ___ no

If yes, would it be because...

36. You like the type of educational system
- a. ___ yes
- b. ___ no

37. The university administration seems to care about the rights and privileges of the students
- a. ___ yes
- b. ___ no

38. There is little "red tape" at OSU
- a. ___ yes
- b. ___ no

39. Students have a say in the way professors teach, how money is spent in the policies in general
- a. ___ yes
- b. ___ no

Please write any comments and suggestions you have about the questionnaire on the back of the LAST page of the questionnaire. Then return the questionnaire to the lady distributing them today.

THANK YOU

APPENDIX B

The Ohio State University Poll's Distribution of Fall 1975 Students, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

TABLE 41

Field of Study

	Per Cent	Number
Agriculture	7	(24)
Social and behavioral	10	(31)
Arts and humanities	8	(26)
Physical and biological science	10	(29)
Professional	18	(54)
Business administration	12	(37)
Education	17	(54)
Engineering	7	(21)
Other	10	(29)
Total	100	305

TABLE 42

Class Rank

	Per Cent	Number
Graduate	15	(26)
Seniors	37	(114)
Juniors	19	(59)
Sophomores	19	(57)
Freshmen	15	(47)
Total	100	305

TABLE 43

Parent's Occupation

	Per Cent	Number
Businessmen	39	(121)
White collar	21	(66)
Blue collar	21	(66)
Farmers	2	(7)
Unemployed	16	(16)
Don't know or not applicable	10	(29)
Total	100	305

TABLE 44

Parent's Income

	Per Cent	Number
Greater than $40,000	8	(26)
$30,000 - $39,999	6	(19)
$24,000 - $29,999	7	(20)
$18,000 - $23,999	13	(39)
$14,000 - $17,999	11	(35)
$11,000 - $13,999	10	(29)
$ 8,000 - $10,999	7	(22)
Less than $9,999	6	(18)
Don't know or not applicable	32	(97)
Total	100	305

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1965 "ALA asks Victimized Libraries to Contact Special Committee," Library Journal 89:1574.

Atkinson, Hugh
1975 interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Berry, John N.
1965 "To Catch a Thief," Library Journal 90:1617-1621.

Bond, William
1973 "Eleven steps can lead you to curtailing inventory losses and crime in the campus bookstore: College and University Business 54:3:53.

Braden, Irene A.
1968 "A Pilot Inventory of Library Holdings." American Library Association Bulletin. 62:1129-31.

Bureau of the Census
1972 Social and Economic Statistics of United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Burnes Security Institute
1973 National Survey on Library Security Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 080131.

Cameron, Mary Owen
1964 Booster and the Snitch. London: Free Press of Glenco, Collier and Macmillan Limited.

Clark, John P. and Eugene P. Wenninger
1962 "Socio-Economic Class and Areas Correlates of Illegal Behavior Among Juveniles." American Sociological Review 24:826-834.

Clark, John P. and Larry L. Tift
1966 "Polygraph and Interview Validation of Self-Reported Deviant Behavior," American Sociological Review 31:516-523.

Daughtery, Robert Allen
1975 Interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Gapan, Kaye
1971 "The Book Thief," Master's thesis, University of Washington.

1975 Interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

1976 Interview held at The Ohio State University Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Geis, Gilbert
1974 "Avocational Crime," Handbook of Criminology, Daniel Glaser, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 272-273.

Gould, Leroy C.
1969 "Who Defines Delenquency: A Comparison of self-reported and officially reported indices of delinquency for 3 racial groups," Social Problems 16:325-326.

Green, H.
1964 "Analysis of Literature Dealing With Vandalism as Indexed in Library Literature 1953-63." Master's thesis, Atlanta University.

Hendrick, Clyde and Marjorie E. Murfin
1974 "Project Library Ripoff: A Study of Periodical Multilation in a University Library," College and Research Libraries 35:402-411.

Hollingshead, August B.
1965 Two Factor Index of Social Position. Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut.

Hood and Sparks
1970 Key Issues in Crime in Toronto: New York: World University Library 46-70.

Humphries, Russell
1974 "Why Do They Steal," The College Store Journal 104-105.

1969 "Librarians Guilty of Stealing, Purloining and Converting Federal Property on Loan to Library," Library Journal 94:24000

Lunden, Walter A.
1966 Shoplifting Among College Students. Ames Iowa: Iowa State University Science and Technology.

Morrison, Perry D.
1966 "Lost Book Campaign as Sacramento," Wilson Library Bulletin 40:526-529.

Nunes, John
1972 "The Electronic Librarian," College Management 7:26-27.

Nye, F. Ivan and James F. Short
1957 "Scaling Delinquent Behavior." American Sociological Review 22:325-331.

Oliner, S.P. and Maurice, Manuel
1975 "Student Theft: Crime or Protest. Humboldt Journal of Social Relations.

Ohio State Librarians
Unpublished study.

The Ohio State University
1974 An Ohio State University Poll Report on Student Library Usage. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Pace, C. Robert
1964 The Influence of Academic and Student Subcultures in College and University Environments. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services DE 003037.

Personnel Office
1975 Interview held in Ohio State University Main Library Room 208, June 1957.

Poland, Stephen
1971 "Characteristics Behavior, Attitudes of Male College Students Who Have Committed Theft." Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University.

Quick, Mary
1964 "A Proposed Program for Reducing Book Losses," Master's thesis, West Michigan University.

Reneker, Maxine
1970 "Book Theft in Academic Libraries." Master's thesis, University of Chicago.

Savage, Ernest A.
1959 "Buy, Borrow, or Steal: Thieves' Methods," Library Journal 84:141-145.

Schefrin, Rita A.
1971 "The Barriers to and Barriers of Library Security," Wilson Library Journal 45:870-878.

Smigel, Erwin
1970 "Attitudes Towards Stealing Related to Size of Victim Organization" in Crime Against Bureaucracy, Erwin Smigel and H. Lawrence Ross eds. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 15-27.

Smiley, Jackie
1975 Interview held at The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio.

Stern, George
1966 Studies of College Environments. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 010647.

Sutuci, Sano
1975 "Protection: Open Access from Chained Libraries." Tosh-Kai. 25:27-30.

Trangri, Savera and Michael Schwartz
1967 "Delinquency research and self concept Variable" Journal of Criminal Law, Crimology, and Police Science 58:182-190.

Trelles, Oscar M.
1973 "Protection of Libraries." Law Library Journal 66:241-258.

Vaz, E.W.
1969 "Delinquency and Youth Culture: Upper and Middle Class Boys," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science 60:33-46.

Vinnes, Norman
1969 "A Search for Meaning in Book Theft," Scholastic Librarian 18:25-27.

Waldo, Gordon P. and Mason E. Hall
1970 "Delinquency Potential and Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System," Social Forces 49:291-298.

Zimmerman, Lee
1960 "Pilfering and Mutilating Books," Bookmark 13:5-9.